

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections and further examination are requested. Upon entry of this amendment, claims 13-15 are added, leaving claims 1-7 and 9-15 pending with claim 1 being independent. No new matter has been added.

Interview

Applicants appreciate the interview granted by the Examiner in charge of this application. In the interview, the Examiner indicated that further defining that the coloring agent as being disposed in a detachable cartridge may overcome the cited prior art.

As noted above, new dependent claims 13-15 further define the coloring agent as suggested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becerra et al. (U.S. 2004/0072049) in view of Cornell (U.S. 4,079,729).

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and submit that the claims as currently pending are allowable over the cited prior art. Specifically, independent claim 1 recites a liquid fuel container comprising a coloring agent, which is placed in at least part of the outer peripheral portion of a liquid fuel holding section and part of the outer peripheral portion of a product holding section, the coloring agent being configured to change the color of liquid fuel when the coloring agent comes in contact with liquid fuel leaked from the liquid fuel holding section and change the color of water when the coloring agent comes in contact with water leaked from the product holding section, the color of the changed liquid fuel being different from the color of the changed water.

The cited prior art fails to disclose or render obvious such a container. In particular, as discussed with the Examiner, Becerra only discloses that the fuel substance may be mixed with one or more additives that increase the detectability of the fuel if the fuel escapes from the container. Additionally, Becerra discloses that the additives can include a color component and that the additives can be stored and maintained separately from the fuel. Thus, in Becerra, the additives are used only for improving the detectability of fuel that has escaped from the container

and not another substance, such as water. Becerra does not disclose (explicitly or inherently) identifying different kinds of leaked liquid (fuel or water) by a difference between the changed color of the liquid. In fact, there is no disclosure in Becerra of an additive that is used to detect if the Becerra effluent leaks from its container. Although the Examiner maintains that Becerra inherently discloses such an additive, Applicants submit that the Examiner is engaging in improper hindsight to render this element of claim 1 obvious. The only evidence of an additive used to identify leaked fuel and leaked water is the specification of the present application. Moreover, Applicants submit that merely because something may occur is not sufficient to establish inherency. To establish inherency, “the extrinsic evidence must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present.” Inherency may not be established by possibilities or probabilities. *See* MPEP § 2112. Applicants submit that this element is not necessarily present in Becerra. Therefore, Applicants submit that Becerra fails to disclose this element of independent claim 1.

Moreover, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined Becerra with Cornell to render the claims of this application obvious. In particular, the claims of the present application are directed to the identification of the leakage of fuel and leakage of water by the difference between their changed colors. However, Becerra is only concerned with the leakage of fuel, while Cornell does not disclose any identification of leakages of two kinds of liquid by the difference between their two colors.

Therefore, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined these references to render claim 1 obvious. Thus, claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable over the cited prior art.

Claims 9 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Becerra in view of Cornell as applied to claims 1-4, 6 and 7, and further in view of Yoshiki et al. (JP 03-015467). Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Becerra in view of Cornell as applied to claims 1-4, 6 and 7, and further in view of Hsu (U.S. 2003/0097762). Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Becerra in view of Cornell as applied to claims 1-4, 6 and 7 above, and further in view of Ebbeson (U.S. 4,416,617). Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Becerra.

Applicants submit that since each of these claims is dependent from claim 1 and since none of these additionally cited references overcome the deficiencies of Becerra and Cornell, each of the these claims is allowable over the cited prior art for the reasons set forth above.

New Claims 13-15

Applicants submit that since claims 13-15 are dependent from claim 1, each of these claims is allowable over the cited prior art for the reasons set forth above. Moreover, each of these claims further distinguished itself over the cited prior art. In particular, each of these claims recites that the liquid fuel container is configured to be detachably mounted to a power generation module. Applicants submit that none of the cited combinations of art disclose or render obvious a liquid fuel container that is configured to be detachably mounted to a power generation module.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all of the claims now pending in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action are respectfully solicited.

Should the Examiner believe there are any remaining issues that must be resolved before this application can be allowed, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Makoto IYODA et al.

/Jeffrey J. Howell/

By 2010.02.03 13:40:29 -05'00'

Jeffrey J. Howell

Registration No. 46,402

Attorney for Applicants

JJH/ekb
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 3, 2010